

Comment on the proposed suppression of *Eutermes* Heer, 1849 to conserve the generic names *Nasutitermes* Dudley, 1890 and *Microcerotermes* Silvestri, 1901, and on the proposed designation of *Eutermes costalis* Holmgren, 1910 as type species of *Nasutitermes* Dudley, 1890 (Insecta, Isoptera)
(Case 3292; see BZN 62: 8–13, 149–150)

Michael S. Engel

Division of Entomology, Natural History Museum, Snow Hall, 1460 Jayhawk Boulevard, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045–7523, U.S.A.

Kumar Krishna

Division of Invertebrate Zoology, American Museum of Natural History, Central Park West at 79th Street, New York, N.Y. 10024–5192, U.S.A.

Recently our colleague Yves Roisin (BZN 62: 149–150) has challenged our petition to conserve the universally applied generic names *Nasutitermes* Dudley, 1890 and *Microcerotermes* Silvestri, 1901 over the name *Eutermes* Heer, 1849. Proposed for a fossil taxon, *Eutermes* has priority over most genus-group names throughout the Isoptera owing to its early establishment (see our application). As such, regardless of its definition, this name threatens to upset any genus name within the Isoptera with the sole exclusion of *Termes*. However, despite its age, the name has not been employed in modern classifications of the Isoptera, and it is thereby poised to impose maximal disruption to the stability of termite nomenclature. The name poses a further problem in that the family-group name EUTERMITINAE Holmgren, 1910b is also in a position to jeopardize universally employed family-group names within the Isoptera. We are preparing a monographic catalog of the Isoptera, and placing *Eutermes* in NASUTITERMITINAE Hare, 1937 would thereby render *Nasutitermes* and NASUTITERMITINAE junior objective synonyms, particularly destructive given that this is the most diverse and intensively studied lineage of termites. Our petition was designed to circumvent this difficulty, and we urge the Commission to approve the suppression of the name *Eutermes* in the interest of nomenclatural stability.

As to the designation of a type species by the Commission for *Nasutitermes*: this issue is moot. In more closely examining Banks's papers (1918, p. 665, 1920, p. 69) we find that *Termes morio* Latreille, 1805 was indeed an originally included species (overlooked in our original petition)—a species that Banks later (1920, p. 69) selected as the type species of *Nasutitermes*. *Termes morio* Latreille, 1805, however, is an unavailable name as it is a misidentification of the available name *T. morio* Fabricius, 1793. Thus, the issue is Banks's concept of *T. morio* and whether or not *Eutermes costalis* Holmgren, 1910 can be considered a replacement name of *T. morio* Latreille as erroneously suggested by Emerson (1925) (see our application). Indeed, past authors, Emerson included, despite erroneous reasoning accepted *E. costalis* as type species of *Nasutitermes* (as explained in our application). Rather than accept this perpetuated error we have asked the Commission to use its plenary powers to overrule the designation based on erroneous assumptions and instead validate *E. costalis* based on appropriate grounds (as already stated in the petition).